

REMARKS

Claims 1-3 and 8-24 are currently pending, claims 4-7 having been cancelled in a Preliminary Amendment filed on October 7, 2005.

Claims 1-3 and 8-24 are currently rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 2,485,434 to Cynamon et al. (hereinafter the "Cynamon" reference). The Applicant respectfully traverses the pending rejection and requests that the rejection be withdrawn because the Cynamon reference does not disclose each and every element of any of the pending claims.

More specifically, independent claim 1 as currently pending recites a vehicle suspension "comprising a pair of leaf springs locatable on respective opposed sides of a vehicle chassis and extending longitudinally thereof, and an anti-roll device which is arranged to extend transversely of the vehicle chassis, and means mounting opposed ends of the anti-roll device rigidly to respective ones of the pair of opposed leaf springs" (emphasis added). As described in the specification of the present application, the rigid mounting of the anti-roll device provides benefits over prior art vehicle suspensions that allow the anti-roll device to move within its mounting. See, e.g., Specification at p. 6 line 15 to p. 8 line 23. In contrast, the Cynamon reference discloses that:

The ends of bar 10 are attached to [leaf] springs 17 by means of U-bolts 18 which embrace springs 17 and extend upwardly through holes 11 in said bar 10. Strong compression springs 20 are mounted on each arm of U-shaped bolts 18, and they are locked in place by means of nuts 21. It will be seen particularly in Fig. 3 that a strong, yet resilient, connection is thereby provided between the end of stabilizing bar 10 and the leaf springs 17.

Cynamon reference at Col. 2 lines 8 to 17 (emphasis added). The Cynamon reference, therefore, does not disclose a rigidly mounted anti-roll device as recited in

currently pending independent claim 1. Because the cited reference does not disclose each and every limitation of claim 1, neither claim 1 nor the claims that depend therefrom are anticipated.

Additionally, dependent claim 9 as currently presented recites that “the anti-roll device has its opposed ends mounted rigidly to said mounting means to at least one end of the leaf springs” (emphasis added). The Cynamon reference discloses that the stabilizing bar “is connected to the forward end 12 of the rear end housing 13,” as well as that “its end portions rest upon the top leaf of leaf springs 17.” Cynamon reference at Col. 1 line 46 to Col. 2 line 8. As shown in Fig. 1 of the Cynamon reference, this arrangement does not result in the stabilizing bar being mounted to at least one end of the leaf springs as recited in currently pending claim 9.

Further, dependent claims 11 through 13 have been amended to recite that “the opposed ends of the anti-roll device are offset from the neutral axis in bending of each of the opposed leaf springs by means of spacers.” The neutral axis is described as being “that internal layer of the beam which extends longitudinally and approximately centrally of the section of the beam.” Specification at p. 17 lines 27-30. Such an offset can be provided, for example, as illustrated in Figure 13 of the present application, where spacer 44 is located between anti-roll tube 12 and leaf spring 1. In contrast, the Cynamon reference does not disclose such offset or such spacers. Instead, Fig. 3 of the Cynamon reference shows compression springs 20 mounted on U-shaped bolts on the side of stabilization bar 10 opposite leaf springs 17. Applicant respectfully submits that the August 6, 2007 Office Action is incorrect in asserting that compression springs 20 as disclosed in the Cynamon reference are spacers as recited in currently amended claims 11 through 13.


CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks presented above, the Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-3 and 8-24 as currently amended are in a condition for allowance.

Applicant believes that a fee of \$460 is currently due in conjunction with the two month Petition for extension of time submitted herewith. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the fee of \$460, as well as any additional fees that may be necessary, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 18-2284, in the name of DLA Piper US LLP.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 7, 2008


Jennifer Lacroix
Reg. No. 46,852
Attorney for Applicants

PATENT GROUP
DLA Piper US LLP
203 North LaSalle Street, Suite 1900
Chicago, Illinois 60601-1293
312.368.7138 T
312.236-7516 F
patentschgo@dlapiper.com